DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 225 JC 810 346

AUTHOR Marty, Myron
TITLE All in a Day's Work.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 13p.: Keynote address at the Conference on Strengthening the Humanities in Occupational Curricula (Memphis, TN, March 31, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; *Community Colleges; *Curriculum Enrichment; *Definitions; Humanism; *Humanities; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS National Endowment for the Humanities

ABSTRACT

A definitional framework is presented for the issues addressed by the Conference on Strengthening the Humanities in Occupational Curricula. After noting the diversity of the nontraditional student populations at community colleges, the paper looks at the definitions of words related to the conference theme: "curriculum," "occupation," "career," "vocation," "humanities," "humanitarian," and "humanist." This examination includes a discussion of three ways of defining the humanities: (1) using the definition employed in the legislation that created the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH); (2) contrasting the humanities with the sciences; and (3) defining the humanities according to their function, that is, they help individuals make sense of life, to see themselves from different angles, to reflect on the meaning of their beliefs and values, to respond with reason and feeling to their environments, and to understand the larger culture. Finally, the paper explores the use of this functional definition of the humanities in effecting curricular changes; warns that the sensitivities and faculties used in studying the humanities must be constantly practiced; urges participants to contact the NEH; and quotes Woodrow Wilson and Ralph W. Emerson to encourage the participants in their efforts to strengthen the humanities curriculum. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205225

ALL IN A DAY'S WORK

Myron Marty

Keynote Address -
Conference on Strengthening the Humanities
in Occupational Curricula
Memphis, Tennessee
March 31, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Myron Marty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 810 346

ALL IN A DAY'S WORK

Keynote Address -- Conference on Strengthening
the Humanities in Occupational Curricula
Memphis, Tennessee
March 31, 1981

Myron Marty

When I signed in at the National Endowment for the Humanities almost a year ago I went through the paces of a new employee. I filled out stacks of forms, submitted to fingerprinting, posed for one of those pictures that invariably make one look as though his eyes are fixed on a doctor with a needle in his hand, and picked up a little plastic identification card. I also learned for the first time what my title would be. I am a humanist administrator. That means, I suppose, that doing humanities and doing administration and doing them together is all in a day's work. Just so, coming to speak at this conference is all in a day's work.

Or perhaps it would be if I could erase from my memory all the things I got myself into when I signed in almost fifteen years ago as a community college teacher. I was forewarned, all right. In fact, the interview that led to my appointment seemed designed to discourage me from accepting any offer the college might eventually make. Who in his right mind would want to teach such ill-prepared students, and so many of them, in crowded barracks, with practically no library available? And who would want to share an office with twelve others in a 55-foot trailer?

Perhaps it would be all in a day's work, too, if I were indifferent toward the plight of the humanities, or if I saw little hope for strengthening their position in the curricula of institutions where they are persistently and systematically slighted. But I cannot erase my memory. One cannot erase what is etched with acid and carved with chisels. And I am not indifferent. And I am hopeful. And I am here.

******

Let us try to get this conference off to a good start by being clear on what it is all about. The purpose is implied in the conference title. It is a conference about community colleges. Now for you, community colleges are all in a day's work. It is all in a day's work for you to rub elbows with the unscrubbed multitudes of America, as some would call them. Although several generations have passed since I first heard that characterization, in many respects it remains a valid one. In the first generation, men, mostly young ones, outnumbered women; women didn't need a II-S classification to stay out of the draft. In this generation were many first-generation college-goers -- as there have continued to

be since then. In the second generation, growing numbers of women were joined by growing numbers of veterans, many of whom seemed more interested in qualifying for benefits than in sharing our interests in the great questions of the ages. In my institution at least, we also saw growing numbers of minority students. The third generation is a mixture of all sorts. Some are highly able but have no time for schoolwork and treat it as an inconvenience. Knowing such, I could understand what a recent NEH applicant meant when he said "seventy percent of our students work full-time or more." Some have loads of time but no interest or no ability. Indeed, time, ability, and interest come in endless varieties of combinations -- which explains why Murphy's Law comes to life in so many classrooms.

Individuals stand out in memories too:

+ The letter carrier who gave college a try, discovered he's a whiz, sailed through a bachelor's degree and an M.B.A., teaches part-time at a local university, but continues to deliver mail because that's what he likes to do.

+ The gentle, thirty-one year old Harley Davidson devotee who confessed, when complimented on a reasonably well-done book review, that not only was it the first book review he ever wrote, it was the first book he ever read.

+ Young men and women right out of high school who sat next to men and women as old as their parents, teaching them and learning from them. Among them were a pair of brothers, who convinced their widowed mother that her ten children wanted her to go back to school, which she did

+ The World War II bomber pilot who enrolled in college classes with his sons and became a dove, sort of, on Vietnam.

+ The black retiree who could remember the soup lines of the depression -- to be followed by someone who remembered the Lusitania. And last year I had a student who could almost remember the Maine. I was waiting, yet, for someone who remembered the Alamo.

The rewards are many. So are the frustrations. Some people subscribe to a black hole theory that has to do with mysteries of the universe. The black hole I know best is the one on every community college campus that swallows up students. You know how it is: They don't miss a day of class for six weeks, and then, all of a sudden they disappear. Occasionally, but rarely, they escape from the black hole, reappearing after a three or four week absence to ask every teacher's favorite question: "Did I miss anything?" And then they bounce in and out for weeks until, at the very end they ask the second favorite question: "What do I have to do to get a 'C'?" Some students, don't disappear, of course, they keep on appearing without ever being present. I call this kind shoplifters. They sneak in and try to make off with three credits, hoping that no one will notice them.

Perhaps the most intractable problem of a community college teacher is the problem of attrition. No matter the strategy I tried -- gentleness, a soft beginning, matter-of-factness in laying out expectations and assignments all at once, striking terror by overloading and gaining appreciation by easing up -- no matter the strategy, my attrition rate was almost constant at 30 percent. "Attrition" derives from the verb "to attrit," which means to wear down by constant friction. What I couldn't understand was attrition without friction. Can you?

In getting ready for this event, I toyed with definitions for community colleges. It is time to come to such a definition now. Having been struck by their polyglot character, I recalled the definition of polyglot that showed up on a test given by a friend of mine. A polyglot, the student wrote, is a "many-sided glot." So is a community college. When you design curricula, you must keep that in mind.

******

With that definition in hand, we can turn to another word in the conference title. Now I know that to you curricula are all in a day's work, and not always very pleasant work at that. Who wants to serve on a curriculum committee! Offering to serve on one is much like volunteering for the infantry in wartime. But I want to urge you to give the word curricula closer attention for a moment. A curriculum is a regular course of training. It is rooted in "currere," meaning "to run." It is therefore a running course, a course on which one advances one step or one stride at a time. A curriculum that takes a dash here and a dabble there is not a curriculum. To throw some humanities into a curriculum without regard for their place in the course being run serves little purpose.

We can enrich our understanding of the word curriculum, or at least give it a more vivid image in our minds, if we associate it with its first cousin, curricle -- the vehicle that runs the course, or rather is drawn on it. A curricle is a two-wheeled carriage drawn by two horses. When I ponder that for a moment, I try to imagine a one-wheeled curricle -- or a curricle drawn by just one horse, going around in circles. A purpose of this conference, it seems to me, is to find ways of insuring that every curriculum has two wheels -- call them liberal and practical, if you will -- and is drawn by two horses, which you may call the humanities and occupational if you wish.

******

And that leads me to a third word in the conference title: occupational. This is another word that is all in a day's work for many of you. But I wonder why this is the word that was chosen for this conference. Might it not have been career curricula? I know that career is the term used in some community colleges. Perhaps it is a word that promises too much. A career is "a course of

professional life or employment, which affords opportunity for progress or advancement in the world." The evidence is fairly strong that job-related programs in colleges and universities provide but slight pushes toward genuine careers. The promise, in fact, is often only that of entry-level job skills, of entry into a room with a very low ceiling and not many doors. A college career curriculum does not guarantee a career.

Perhaps there is another reason for not using the word career, for career has a meaning as a verb. It means to take a short gallop, or to turn this way and that in running. In fact, it is closely related to the word careen. Many careers do careen, turning this way and that. That is not necessarily bad, nor is it avoidable. But let's keep that in mind when we talk about career curricula.

Why not vocational curricula? A vocation is something to which we are called. Indeed, it is our calling. Do college curricula, really, help people answer a call? Or is their role somewhat less sublime than that? Is the call students hear perhaps the call of the marketplace rather than a call of the heart?

Occupation is really a very good and appropriate term for the curricula on which this conference intends to focus. An occupation, says the dictionary, is an activity that serves as one's regular source of livelihood. But other definitions of occupation give one pause: "An activity engaged in especially as a means of passing time." Or: "The act or process of holding a place," as in a military occupation. Passing time? Holding a place? Surely occupational curricula must do more than that. If they are indeed curricula, they do that -- especially if they are two-wheeled curricula.

We come now to the word humanities. This is a word that needs closer attention, for to many of you the humanities are not all in a day's work. What are the humanities? In one sense the humanities are what we as doers of the humanities say they are, which brings to mind Jocko Conlon's remark on umpiring: "There ain't no balls or strikes till I call 'em. The pitcher can throw 'em and the catcher can catch 'em and I can make up anything and when I call it, it's there." But Jocko Conlon wouldn't have lasted long as an umpire if he had not observed the strike zone and called the pitches accordingly. Nor will we last long if we work without a strike zone for the humanities.

One definition of the strike zone was laid out in the legislation that created the National Endowment for the Humanities. It lists the disciplines that comprise the humanities. The list includes language; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism and theory of the arts; those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment, with particular attention to

the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life. This definition will do. It draws some lines, suggests some possibilities, establishes a zone.

Another way to define the humanities is in terms of contrasts. It is useful to contrast the humanities with the sciences. One difference is in their ways of knowing. The scientific way is clearly established and widely known. It begins with the formulation of a hypothesis, which is then tested under carefully controlled circumstances. From this a conclusion emerges, but the conclusion is always subject to further testing. In science the emphasis is on empirical, objective evidence, which alone points to truth.

In the humanities it is different. The empirical, objective way cannot work because the circumstances for testing hypotheses cannot be controlled. Besides, objectivity is always an elusive goal, for reasons that are readily apparent. In the humanities our ways of knowing bring to bear such things as insight and intuition rooted in experience, personal and cultural. For each of us, then, and for people of differing cultures, our ways of knowing are different. There are elements in the world, in nature, in all the realms of humankind that are perceived in special ways by folks coming to them from different contexts and cultures. And they are simply not knowable by the route of scientific inquiry.

To understand this realm, to understand it humanistically, requires us, as Michael Scruton has expressed it, to "cultivate the peculiar faculty -- the faculty of Verstehen -- which we use to understand ourselves." More simply, it requires cultivation of the habit of reflection: reflection on life, on things in life and nature, on relationships between elements in life and nature; on perspectives and angles and insights; on such things as irony and paradox.

I must add a caution: Do not assume that scientific ways of knowing are not useful to those who do the humanities. They are, but they are assimilated as one ingredient in a larger process of knowing that keeps the scientific impulse in check. And do not misunderstand me when I encourage the cultivation of the habit of reflection. I do not mean reflection in the narcissistic sense, where the emphasis is on the self, on the wonderful me, me, me, as folks from the touchy-feely schools of human potential development would have it. It is reflection influenced by insights drawn from history, literature, and philosophy and occurring in contexts that go far beyond the individual.

And another caution: Scientists, good ones, are sensitive to humanistic ways of knowing. This sensitivity derives, in its most sophisticated sense, from the recognition that for nature to be comprehended it must be seen as something other than entirely deterministic and for life to be seen as unpredictable, exciting, mysterious, a work of art. Take Lewis Thomas, as an example of someone who knows this. Although he is not formally associated

with scientists known for exploring the nondeterministic and unpredictable elements of nature and life, his The Lives of a Cell is not entirely at odds with the ways of humanists.

There is yet a third way of defining the humanities. They can be defined, I believe, according to what they do. This is my functional definition of the humanities: The humanities encompass those studies that help students (a) to find and make sense out of relationships between their life, work, and jobs; (b) to see themselves and their society from different angles, different times, different places, and through different eyes; (c) to reflect on the meaning of their doings, habits, and beliefs; (d) to respond with both reason and feeling to their natural and man-made environments; and (e) to acquire a share of knowledge and understanding in the larger culture of which they are a part and whose inheritance is also theirs. Standing alone, each of these functions may be cultivated apart from the humanities. Taken together, the essential presence of the humanities is taken for granted. If school or school-related activities do these things -- whether they are called history, literature, philosophy, or cultural anthropology or something else -- they are humanities.

The fifth of these functions in effect calls for a sharing in the culture's memory. This kind of sharing may not be possible anymore. There may not be enough unum left with the pluribus for a coherent core of the larger culture to be identified. I would like to think that there is, and then I do something foolish like taking another look at a book written a dozen years ago by Andrew Hacker, The End of the American Era. This book makes me wonder whether we have not only become what he calls an Ungovernable Nation but a Fallen Apart Society as well. He points out, for example, how amid rising affluence, individuals find themselves in a society that is decaying at an accelerating rate. "The list of discomforts," he says, "is too familiar to warrant elaboration: overcrowded schools and understaffed hospitals, clogged highways leading to jammed recreation areas, growing slums producing a rising crime rate. When Americans set foot from their homes, they enter an environment that is physically dangerous, aesthetically repellent, and morally disquieting. The public domain has ceased to be civilized territory."

He adds, in a footnote: "As citizens begin to experience prosperity, their attitudes and expectations change in such ways as to require proportionately more public services. As personal income rises, the ways individuals spend their additional earnings tend to create social problems that did not hitherto exist.... If, as seems... likely, we insist on keeping our tax rates constant at a fixed proportion of the GNP, then we will find ourselves waiting longer in congested airports, living more restively amid growing mounds of garbage, and sending our children to understaffed and overcrowded colleges." Read the whole book, if you are up to it.

How can we be hopeful? I rest my hope on the belief that by recovering some sense of the values in which our society is presumably rooted, we can overcome the problems that shortsightedness has caused and which seem to invite shortsighted solutions. If this hope is to be realized, we need the humanities -- we really do.

Having spent this much time discussing what we mean by the humanities, we should take note of several words that sound as though they should be associated with the humanities and that, in varying degrees, are or are not so related. Let's start with humanitarian. A humanitarian is one who is concerned with the needs of humankind and the alleviation of human suffering. Let us hope that those who do the humanities are also humanitarian in outlook. Let us also require that those who work in the humanities, especially those who teach them, have more to commend them for their tasks than a humanitarian outlook. Without credentials, without grounding in at least one of the disciplines of the humanities, a class taught by a mere humanitarian might well deserve to be labeled Remedial Bull.

The word humanist is one that today needs special attention, mainly because its meaning has been willfully distorted by religious belligerents who need a bogey in their efforts to frighten folks into following them. The name they chose for their bogey was "humanist," a curious choice, since until they seized upon it a humanist was merely someone who was in the humanities, people who worked with texts, who relived the past and mused on its meaning in the present. Hardly anybody's bogey.

The real enemy of the religious belligerents is secularism, quite understandably, and so attacking the minuscule number of persons who call themselves secular humanists because they specifically deny the sacred and the transcendent in their work is at least plausible. To drop the term secular and to blanket all humanists with the charge that they are dangerous is malicious nonsense of the sort that is hard to counter with rational discourse. Perhaps the best way to meet it -- and make no mistake about it, it must be met in some parts of the country -- is to explain patiently just what the humanities are, in terms I have used earlier here, and to explain, yet more patiently, that there is nothing in the humanities that is inherently anti-religious or anti-Christian and that the humanities in our culture require respectful study of religious traditions. But remember the motive of the attackers when you find that your explanations fall on stone ears.

Perhaps it would be desirable if we could revive a word that for more than a hundred years, back in the 17th century, served a good purpose but which the Oxford English Dictionary now calls obsolete. This is the word humanitian: "one versed in the 'humanities'; a classical scholar."

After that long discourse on the humanities, we come now to the final term remaining in the title of the conference: strengthening. What a wonderful term this becomes when we think of all of its implications. To be strong means to be more than muscular. It means to have stamina, to be vigorous, to be supple, to be resilient, to have tone. To strengthen means to reinforce, fortify, entrench. To stiffen, toughen, harden. To animate, enliven, quicken. Think of what applying these implications of "strengthening" means for the humanities in occupational programs. Doing that is hardly all in a day's work. Not if it is done right, not if it is done purposefully, persistently, persuasively.

******

I had the privilege several months ago to address a group of your counterparts in Los Angeles. I stated my purpose then as threefold: First, to encourage thinking about the humanities in occupational curricula; second, to provoke caring about the humanities in occupational curricula; and third, to prompt acting on the humanities in occupational curricula. Thinking, caring, and acting -- that is what I told them the conference was all about.

I may have had it wrong. Thinking may not be the place to start. Seldom do we change people's ways of acting by first changing their ways of thinking. Rather, by changing their ways of acting we compel changes in ways of thinking. And so I urge you not to postpone action while thinking in your institution takes shape or even while your own thinking crystallizes. The best way to get started in effecting curricular change is to get started.

Taking the functional definition of the humanities outlined above as a starting point, suppose you ask yourself how to help students to make sense out of relationships between life, work, and jobs. You do it by studying life, work, and jobs in history and literature. As the Commission on the Humanities report puts it, "the humanities mirror our image and the image of our world." Thus there is a mirror in a comparison of the American work ethic with the Russian work ethic and the way they have developed through history. There is a mirror in the industrial and agricultural applications of the Puritan ethic. There is a mirror in the literature on child labor, on labor unions, on work and jobs -- with work understood as the fulfilling side of life, the artisan side, and jobs as the survival side of life, the foodgathering side. There is a mirror in the American dream and the myths surrounding it.

How do individuals see themselves and their society from different perspectives? By looking in the mirror of time, the mirror of place, the mirror of culture. Do you read a book, particularly a novel, for what the book tells you about another time and place or about the author? Maybe. More likely you read it for what it tells you about yourself and your times. You read it as the mirror that it is. By transplanting yourself to other

times, other places, other cultures, you come to understandings of your own time, your own place, your own culture. Perspective is the mirror.

How do you come to understand your doings, your habits your beliefs? By holding them up to the mirror of the humanities. The habit of reflection -- that is what the humanities seek to develop. You compare your doings, judge your habits, test your beliefs against what you see in others. And you understand others better in the process. And yourself, too.

What is the nature of your response to the mirrors around you? Part of it is a reasoned response: you analyze, synthesize, integrate, interpret, and apply your conclusions to new situations, new circumstances. But you also respond with feeling -- feelings of joy, sorrow, relief, pain, anticipation, excitement, disappointment, hope, faith, encouragement, disbelief, optimism, pessimism, cyncism -- on and on the range of feelings runs. And the range of stimuli is the whole range of the human experience from birth to death. In seeing the humanities as a mirror, you find a way to come to terms with those things in nature that defy or elude scientific analysis.

How do you acquire a share in the core of the common culture that surrounds you? By exploring it, by immersing yourself in it, by pulling out threads of it and wrapping yourself in them, by memorizing (that's right -- memorizing) facts about it and words from it and making its images your own.

******

Some cautions. The first caution is that the humanities <u>can</u> be a mirror. They <u>can</u> give perspective, they <u>can</u> help one make sense out of relationships, they <u>can</u> encourage reflection., they <u>can</u> stimulate reasoned and emotional responses to environments, they <u>can</u> offer a share in a common culture. They <u>can</u> do good things for those who come in touch with them, or better, immerse themselves in them. They do not do these things, automatically, mechanically, predictably, unfailingly. The faculties and sensitivities required to do the humanities are developed only through use.

The second caution has to do with the conduct of this conference. Some may perceive that my reference to such things as two-wheeled curricles or tensions between practical and liberal education or contrasts between the sciences and the humanities sets the stage for an argument over the relative merits of occupational or technological or scientific education as opposed to education in the humnanities. Such arguments would fail to serve the purposes of this conference Discussion on relationships between the various sides there must be, but the discussions should be based on the understanding that the purpose of the conference is to find ways of strengthening the humanities in occupational curricula. Some other

agency might wish to fund a conference on strengthening practical education in the liberal arts programs, but this is not such a conference.

******

Much of this conference will be devoted to the question of how one keeps moving the ideas and plans set in motion here. A small part of it will allow for consultations on how a federal agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, has helped institutions in their humanities endeavor and how it stands ready to assist others. The thought of coming to a federal agency for help can be a forbidding one. There is that great big thing called the federal government, and in it is the executive branch, and in it is this agency, and in it are six divisions, and in each division are some programs, and, you are quite right in asking, where in the world do you fit in!

I would urge you to see this agency from the inside out, just as I think you should see your institution from the inside out when the time comes to call for help. You, the faculty member, are at the center of the institution. You may be surrounded by a committee, surrounded by a department, surrounded by a division, surrounded by an administration, surrounded by an institution, maybe even surrounded by a system and a state. Forget for a moment what surrounds you; think only of yourself as the center. And then find the center of help for you at the Endowment. That center is the program officer. Don't worry for the moment, about the rest. After your initial contacts, the rest will make sense, and it surely won't seem so imposing.

******

There is a lot to be discouraged about today as a community college teacher. You can look around you and see colleagues working themselves to death and going unrecognized and unrewarded for it. And you can see colleagues coasting, filling their free time with their real estate businesses or antique shops or travel agencies, while drawing the same pay as their harder working compatriots. You can see students whose apathy is impenetrable and administrators whose disdain for academic excellence is inexplicable. At times you must feel like the young college teacher at Bryn Mawr who wrote this in his private journal nearly a hundred years ago:

> Lecturing to young women of the present generation on the history and principles of politics is about as appropriate and profitable as would be lecturing to stone-masons on the evolution of fashion in dress. There is a painful absenteeism of the mind on the part of the audience. Passing through a vacuum, your speech generates no heat. Perhaps some of it is due to undergraduatism, not all to femininity.

> I have devoted myself to a literary life, but I do not see how a literary life can be built up on foundations of undergraduate instruction. That instruction compels one to live with the commonplace, the A.B.C. of every subject, to dwell upon these with an emphasis and invention altogether disproportionate to their weight and importance; it keeps one on the dusty, century-travelled high-roads of every subject, from which one gets no outlooks except those that are catalogued and vulgarized in every guide-book. One gets weary plodding and yet grows habituated to it and finds all excursions aside more and more difficult. What is a fellow to do? How is he to earn bread and at the same time find leisure, and (in the toils of such a routine) disposition of mind for thoughts entirely detached from and elevated high above the topics of his trade?

So wrote Woodrow Wilson.

I don't know very many persons who would not like to be someplace other than where they are. Part of it is aspiration and ambition. Part of it is mere discontentment. What is the incentive for applying one's self to yet more work in territory worked over so many times? Each person must answer this question for himself or herself. I found an answer that suited me and still suits me in an essay by Emerson:

> There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide; that he must take himself for better or worse as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given him to till. The power which resides in him is new in nature, and none but he knows what that is which he can do, nor does he know until he has tried.

Strengthening the humanities in occupational curricula -- giving them muscle, vigor, stamina, and tone; reinforcing them, fortifying and entrenching them, stiffening, toughening, hardening them -- maybe this is all in a new day's work. And maybe this is a way of enlarging the plots that are ours to till and thus also of renewing ourselves.

I wish you well, here and upon your return to your own plots of ground, and I look forward to receivng word on what grows there as a result of your toils.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

******

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

AUG 28 1981